



JAN 14 2008

PTO/SB/21 (01-08)

Approved for use through 01/31/2008. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

AFD

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL  
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

8

Application Number	09/674,996
Filing Date	Nov. 2, 2000
First Named Inventor	William E. James
Art Unit	3764
Examiner Name	Tam Nguyen

Attorney Docket Number

-----

<b>ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		
Remarks		
<b>REPLY BRIEF</b>		

**SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT**

Firm Name			
Signature			
Printed name	William E. James		
Date	Jan. 12, 2008	Reg. No.	-----

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature	1/12/08		
Typed or printed name	William E. James	Date	Jan. 12, 2008

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellant: William E. James      Examiner: Tam Nguyen

Application No.: 09/674,996      Art Unit: 3764

Filing Date: Nov. 2, 2000      Confirmation No.: 1327

Title: Automatically Variable Stride Walk-Run-Stepper Pedal Exerciser

---

**REPLY BRIEF**

( under 37 CFR 41.41 )

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sirs:

With this Reply Brief appellant requests continuation of appellant's Appeal  
( Brief filed June 14, 2007 ) and replies to examiner's answer of Nov. 16, 2007.

I hereby certify that this correspondence  
is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service  
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to  
the above address on: JAN. 12, 2008

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William E. James".

**1. Status of Claims:**

Claims 1 - 21 are canceled.

The following claims are in appeal:

- Claims 22, 23, 26, 27, 36 and 37 are rejected;
- Claims 24, 25, 28 - 35, 38, 39, 40 and 41\* are withdrawn as subject to restriction.

\* Note: Claim 41 is a second independent claim and has not received any Action comment.

**2. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal:**

**a) Rejection under 37 CFR 1.142(b): ( claims 38 and 40 ):**

Claim 38 is rejected as being drawn to non-elected species as shown in Fig. 7 (Version B-2, pg. 4 of Appeal Brief).

Claim 40 is rejected as being drawn to non-elected species as shown in Figs.17 - 19 ( Version E, pg. 5 of Appeal Brief ).

**b) Rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph: ( claims 22, 23, 26, 27, 36 and 37 ):**

Claim 22 is rejected as not being supported by adequate description in the Specification.

Claims 23, 26, 27, 36 and 37 are rejected being dependent on rejected base claim 22.

Note: Claims 23- 40 are all dependent on claim 22, while claim 41 is a dependent claim similar to claim 22, but has not received any comment in Actions to date.

**3. Argument:**

The examiner does not state to which particular version or species he refers nor by page, line or figure, but since he refers to: "air in the cylinders" (pg. 3, ln. 2), appellant assumes it is in reference to Version B as appellant listed in the Appeal Brief, pg. 4 (Figs. 4-6). This version is described in the Specification, pg. 18, ln. 21 and is a pneumatic, user-powered version. (Key words below underlined for emphasis:)

The Specification description, starting pg.18, ln.35, is simple and straight forward: "A Right Track Bar Cylinder 38 ( note that this is a vertical cylinder responding to step-down force only on the Right Pedal 16) containing a Right Support Spring 40 supports a Right Track Bar 12 and a corresponding Right Pedal 16 and provides pressurized air through a Right to Left Tubing 44 to a Left Return Cylinder 43 which pushes Left Pedal 17 forward as Right Pedal 16 is pushed downward." Continuing on pg. 19, ln.1 , it is explained how Left Track Bar Cylinder 39 (responding to step down on the Left Pedal 17 is linked through Tubing 45 to Right Return Cylinder 42 to push Right Pedal 16 forward as Left Pedal 17 is pushed downward. In Fig. 4 it can be seen that, as described, Tubing 44 connects the output end of Right Track Bar Cylinder 38 (or the Right Pedal "step-down cylinder") to the Left Return Cylinder 43 to return the Left Pedal 17 as the Right Pedal 16 is pushed downward at step-down. Likewise, Tubing 45 connects the Left Track Bar Cylinder 39 to Right Return Cylinder 42 to push the Right Pedal 16 forward as the Left Pedal 17 is pushed downward at step-down.

Therefore it is obvious that pedal return is dependent only on step-down on the opposite pedal and is independent of stride or length of travel of the opposite pedal ( or any pedal ) as in claim 22 , there being no connection between the two Return Cylinders 42 and 43.

In light of the above, showing clearly that each pedal is returned in response only to the opposite pedal's downward motion on step-down, and returns independent of stride, it is very difficult to imagine how one could be confused on this issue.

**Argument** (continued)

The examiner states (pg. 3, ln.4): "In other words , as one pedal moves backwards, the other moves forward at the same rate and thus distance." Also, (pg.3, ln. 8): "...it is not clear to the examiner which components of the invention allow for a first foot pedal to return to the step-down position at the end of each stride independently of stride length of the second foot pedal." The examiner's interpretation is patently wrong.

There is obviously no connection whatever between the pedals (in any of the seven versions - see below) that would cause one pedal to move forward as the opposite pedal moves rearward at the same rate or any rate at all. It was explained early ( pg. 4) in the Specification, in fact, that (ln. 28): " machines directly connecting the pedals for equal and opposite back and forth motion do not provide realistic, normal walk-run action with variable length strides. The first four pages of the Specification outline and explain "the problem" in the field of pedal type exercisers and their inability to provide variable stride normal walk-run action, and that the problem is a result of the typical equal and opposite pedal connection and action. Then, on page 5 the invention's objectives are summarized , especially (ln. 16): " to provide a walk-run reciprocating pedal exercise machine in which the return of each pedal forward to the step-down position from varying stride lengths is initiated and caused by the user's front foot step-down and accompanying opposite foot lift-off action, these two essentially concurrent actions always marking each end of stride." Appellant then went on to fully describe seven versions of the invention in detail as listed in the Appeal Brief ,pages 4 -5 , with short descriptions paraphrasing the referenced section of the Specification. All seven versions were designed to fulfill the above objective.

Each of the seven versions of the invention accomplishes the pedal return "...at end of stride independently of stride..." by somewhat different means as follows:

- Version A has a direct mechanical connection between downward motion (only) of the stepped-on pedal to the return of the opposite pedal.

**Argument (continued):**

- Version B (above described vs. examiner's erroneous interpretation) has a direct pneumatic (master- slave cylinders) connection , acting essentially the same as version A.
- Version B-2 employs an external compressed air source and has "limit valves" operated by the pedals' (small) downward movement to valve air to the opposite pedal's return cylinder as the forward pedal is stepped on.
- Version C has a return spring under each pedal that is compressed during stride by a motor so that the spring returns the (same) pedal forward when the rear striding foot completes the stride and lifts ("end of stride"), the motor drive disengaging.
- Version D also has a return spring , but no motor, with the user's foot force rearward during the stride aided by flywheel momentum extending the spring , which then , returns the (same) pedal at foot lift-off or "end of stride".
- Version E has a motor-driven air pump providing pressurized air controlled by pilot valves (air pressure sensing) responding to step-down and lifting of the foot so that each pedal is allowed to move rearward (stride) in response to step-down on that pedal and is returned forward in response to lifting the foot.
- Version E-2 also has a motor-driven air pump and pilot valves to not only return the pedal upon foot lifting, but also power rearward motion upon step-down on the pedal.

All of this shows that appellant has provided a complete and clear description of the construction and operation of the invention , going beyond the norm to show a wide variety of designs or arrangements that accomplish the stated objectives of the invention and all of which fully meet independent claims 22 and 41. As argued previously, the independent claims 23 - 40 are valid claims as further variations upon the means described in claim 22.

**Argument (continued)**

[ Note: Since the examiner indicated he encourages communications by phone to discuss this, appellant must point out that prior experience with calls to the examiner gives little to no confidence any reasoning is possible. In response to applicant's Amendment of April 30, 04 and following Advisory "not entered" of Oct. 4, 04, applicant called Nov. 1, 04 to discuss the obvious errors in the examiner's description of the prior art (already fully pointed out in the Amendment). The examiner , though not refuting anything applicant explained, finally kept his position. Calls to the SPE and again to the examiner still resulted in examiner saying : "I'm confident of my position." A call to the new SPE, Dec. 14, 04 (after many tries over many days) resulted in: "I have no authority...". And now applicant is faced with equally obvious new errors in the examiner's answer. It is now over seven years and over nine years since Provisional! ]

Therefore, appellant respectfully requests that his Amendment of April 30, 2004 be entered and that the corrections and revisions therein and claims 22 through 41 be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. James (appellant)

Tel: 864 233-8462 or 569 9165

Email: [wejames4@netzero.com](mailto:wejames4@netzero.com)

Jan.12, 2008